

the Department of the Navy of providing a complete substitute facility on the lands acquired. Of the lands to be conveyed to the United States by the State of Oregon, 37,320.31 acres thereof were to become public domain lands of the United States which equal that portion of the bombing range now comprised of public domain lands. The State of Oregon desires to accomplish this exchange in order that the lands now comprising the Boardman Range and lying along the Columbia River might be utilized for its greatest economic potential as a space-age industrial park.

In pursuing the plan as originally contemplated it was found that the site originally selected was unsuitable for a training facility due to the topography and prevailing air currents. An alternative plan has been worked out between the State of Oregon and the Department of the Navy whereby only a part of the existing range would be turned over to the State of Oregon in exchange in part for State-owned lands with the difference in value being paid for by the State at the fair market value. The appraisal will be made by the Bureau of Land Management. The existing range consists of approximately 96,000 acres. Under this new plan it is contemplated approximately 48,000 acres will be turned over to the State of Oregon. The Department of the Navy will retain aviation easements over about 12,000 acres of this land and will receive some 10,000 acres or more of State-owned lands in exchange.

The difference in value will be paid for by the State at the fair market value. In order to preserve the public domain lands now making up a part of the existing range this proposed measure provides that of the lands retained by the Navy and of those to be conveyed by the State to the Navy 37,320.31 acres thereof shall become public domain lands.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee approves of this measure which will allow the Secretary of the Navy sufficient flexibility under the law to carry out a partial conveyance of the lands comprising the Boardman Bombing Range. The modified language proposed contains all protective features included in the original provision. The Government's interests are fully protected and the Department of the Navy will continue to have an entirely satisfactory training facility.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment into law of this measure will not result in any increased cost to the U.S. Government.

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENT

The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate from the bill language which would have reserved for Navy use a portion of the proceeds of the proposed exchange sufficient to defray the cost of building a substitute facility on the new property. This reservation would have permitted the Navy to use Federal funds for construction purposes without their having been specifically appropriated by the Congress.

The Committee on Armed Services is of the opinion that this departure from the established system of providing funds for military construction was, in this instance, not justified.

Therefore, the Committee on Armed Services amended this provision so as to require these funds to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

The effect of the amendment is to require the Navy to obtain approval of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress before Federal funds can be used to construct the substitute facility which will be required if the proposed exchange is effected.

The Department of the Navy has advised the committee that it would not object to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2476) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: **Mr. President,** I wish to make a brief comment with regard to calendar No. 1018, S. 2476, which we passed earlier today. At that time, I did not do what I want to do now, and that is to express my very deep appreciation on behalf of myself and my colleague from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], to the majority and minority leaders, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the ranking Republican member of that committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], for the cooperation that they extended to the two Senators from Oregon in connection with the passage of the bill, which is of great concern and importance in our State. The bill really relates to the defense program of the United States. It was necessary that we have action on this question before adjournment, so that the Boeing Aircraft Co. may proceed with the construction of the testing facilities necessary to test certain equipment that will be vital to the defense of our country.

I wish the members of the Committee on Armed Services to know that they have not only the appreciation of the Senators from Oregon and the members of the Oregon delegation in the House, but I am also authorized to express the deep appreciation of the Governor of the State of Oregon, with whom the Oregon delegation has worked in the closest of cooperation in our endeavor to obtain passage of the bill.

CONSTRUCTIVE ADVICE FOR THE FUTURE MORE IMPORTANT THAN CRITICISM OF THE PAST

Mr. SYMINGTON. **Mr. President,** it was with regret that I read a headline on the front page of a newspaper yesterday.

The first part of the headline stated: "Eisenhower Rakes Kennedy Record; Sees Indecision—Critiques Handling of Crises in Cuba and Laos."

No one is proud of Cuba.

But I was proud of the willingness of President Kennedy to accept full responsibility; and this especially because, as a member of those committees which looked into the matter, I know that members of the government appointed by the previous administration were at least as responsible as anybody in their advice.

As to Laos, the record shows clearly that this problem was strictly an inheritance, caused by previous indecision, vacillation, and delay.

Much of it started back in 1953; and with its culminated problems, was laid on President Kennedy's doorstep last January.

Dien Bien Phu fell May 7, 1954. Let us remember that, and why.

Let us also remember that within a few weeks of his appointment in early 1953, Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson announced plans for cutting over \$7 billion from the armed services.

A few months later, the previous administration adopted its policy of "massive retaliation," thereby insuring there would be inadequacies in the defense capabilities of this country between humiliation and nuclear response.

It is now all too clear how much that incredible "money first" policy cost the Nation, in prestige as well as in actual strength.

When President Eisenhower took office the U.S. Army had 20 combat divisions. When he left, on paper the divisions remaining numbered 14.

But actually there were only 11, because 3 were ineffective training divisions.

The headline on this story also says that former President Eisenhower had profound faith in the services.

That part of the headline reminded me of a recent book, "The Longest Day," a magnificent history of the Normandy landings.

In that book are pictures of four generals.

One is General Eisenhower. The other three—incidentally the first three generals to land in France during the invasion—were generals who during the past administration left the services in protest against the degree of the reduction in our conventional forces—Gen. Matthew Ridgway, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, and Lt. Gen. James Gavin.

Faith is fine. But against Mr. Khrushchev and all that he stands for, we cannot exist on faith alone.

In that connection, on the floor of this body last June 26 I gave details of the actions by the previous administration which resulted in guaranteeing that the United States would be behind the Russians in military rocketry—as the world knows we are today.

The record is clear that the primary reason we now hold a secondary position in space is because the previous administration refused to put up the necessary money.

To those who say some of this problem goes further back, I agree.

In that connection, let them read the testimony by the then General Eisenhower, in open hearing on March 29, 1950, before the Senate Appropriations Committee; and also his answers at that time to questions, many propounded by Senators who are still Members of this body, including the able and distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is in the Chamber at this time.

Perhaps it was right for the previous administration to continue to reduce our Army and Marine Corps in the face of the growing danger. Perhaps we should have accepted as policy allowing the Russians to build and operate hundreds more submarines than we have. Perhaps we should have passed over to them voluntarily the previously referred to lead in space. Perhaps we should have

man who died as a patriot of the world. Dag Hammarskjold believed so fervently in the concept of the United Nations that he lived, fought, and died for it. It is particularly interesting that 13 years ago another great Swede, Count Folke Bernadotte, died in Jerusalem; the earliest well known soldier for this cause. And now Dag Hammarskjold has lost his life in the course of fulfilling his duty for the cause in which he believed.

He had the courage to always say and to do what he believed was right. He did not care whether he offended West or East—his course was firm, unbending, and unyielding in following what he considered the path of international peace, comity, and understanding.

His devotion to his principles placed him directly athwart the unpleasant designs of the Communists in our world. Because he was an obstacle to their efforts, the Communists did all they possibly could to emasculate his office. They sought to neutralize his effectiveness by introducing a troika, or three-headed, version of the Secretary General. And, like any creature possessed of more than one head, such a Frankensteinian creation would indeed have been a monster in every sense of the word.

A man of utter dedication, a man of highest principle, a man of tireless energy, and of deep and unyielding morality, Dag Hammarskjold was indeed a wonderful citizen, a world patriot, and died a world hero.

I salute him, and condole with his family, his friends, and his nation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show my own views, which I have already stated generally, upon the very tragic development today of the death of Dag Hammarskjold.

I express the belief that the best memorial we can erect to this great figure for world peace is for the United Nations, when it meets tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock in New York, not to take any time with formalities but immediately to proceed to the election of an interim successor to Secretary General Hammarskjold; to make a considered judgment upon the position the United Nations should take in the Congo with respect to its actions there; and to reject, as I am sure it will have to reject, the efforts of the Soviet bloc to seek to impose under these circumstances the idea of its troika principle on the United Nations, which would destroy the United Nations.

Mr. President, more than anything else, I express the expectation that the United States will again reassert, through its delegate to the United Nations, the fact that we are not only the most powerful but also the greatest friend of the United Nations, and that we shall expect to implement the effective decisions of the United Nations General Assembly, as we have done before. The United Nations needs this now. I can think of no greater tribute which our country could pay to Dag Hammarskjold, whose name will go down in history as one of the greatest supporters of peace mankind has ever known.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS BETWEEN THE U.S. GOVERNMENT AND OREGON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1018, S. 2476.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CHURCH in the Chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2476) to amend section 207 of the Military Construction Act of 1960 to clarify the authority granted to the Secretary of the Navy to exchange lands owned by the United States for lands owned by the State of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 4, line 3, after the word "receipt", to strike out "and (3) the amount received to defray the cost of providing a complete substitute facility shall be available to the Department of the Navy for the construction and acquisition of such complete substitute facility" and insert "and (3) the amount representing the cost to the Department of the Navy of providing a complete substitute facility on the retained lands, if any, and the State lands so acquired, shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 207 of the Military Construction Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 166, 175) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 207. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be in the public interest, to convey to the State of Oregon all or part of or interest in the lands, including acquired and public domain lands, comprising the Boardman Bombing Range in the State of Oregon, as delineated on a map designated as 'War Department, Office of the Division Engineer, North Pacific Division, Real Estate, Boardman Precision Bombing Range,' approved February 17, 1947, drawing numbered O-31-52. The conveyance of such lands to the State of Oregon shall be made in exchange for a conveyance, without restriction as to the use of lands, to the United States of such lands, or interests therein, of the State of Oregon as the Secretary of the Navy shall find suitable for use, with any lands or interests retained by the Navy, as a bombing range, and upon payment by the State of Oregon to the United States of such amount as the Secretary of the Navy determines to represent the total of (1) the difference, if any, between the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Navy and the fair market value of the land and interests in lands accepted in exchange therefor, and (2) the cost to the Department of the Navy of providing a complete substitute facility on the retained lands, if any, and the State lands so acquired.

"(b) The State of Oregon shall agree to be primarily liable and hold the United States harmless from any claims for personal injury or property damage resulting from

the condition of the lands conveyed by the United States.

"(c) Of the lands retained by the Navy, if any, together with any lands conveyed to the United States by the State of Oregon, 37,320.31 acres thereof, inclusive of any retained public domain lands, as agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy, shall become public domain lands of the United States subject to all the laws and regulations applicable thereto, but shall remain withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, and shall be reserved for use as a bombing range under the administration of the Department of the Navy until such withdrawal and reservation is revoked by order of the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy. The remaining acreage of the lands conveyed to the United States shall become a part of the lands comprising the substitute bombing range and shall be administered by the Department of the Navy.

"(d) The money received by the Secretary of the Navy in connection with the exchange authorized by this Act shall be disbursed as follows: (1) The difference in the fair market value between the public domain lands conveyed by the United States and the lands designated as public domain lands under subsection (c), exclusive of any retained public domain lands, shall be distributed as a receipt from the sale of public domain lands; (2) the difference in the fair market value between the remaining lands and interests exchanged shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt; and (3) the amount representing the cost to the Department of the Navy of providing a complete substitute facility on the retained lands, if any, and the State lands so acquired, shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

"(e) The Department of the Navy shall not be required to relinquish use of any lands of the Boardman Bombing Range to be conveyed to the State of Oregon until the complete substitute facility is available for use."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to amend section 207 of Public Law 86-500 to allow sufficient flexibility for the Secretary of the Navy to exchange only a portion of the lands now comprising the Boardman Bombing Range for lands owned by the State of Oregon. The original provision of the law referred to above provides for a full exchange of the Boardman property for the State-owned lands.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

A provision was included in the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1961 (Public Law 86-500) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Oregon the lands, both acquired and public domain, comprising the Boardman Bombing Range in the State of Oregon in exchange for a conveyance without restriction of lands owned by the State of Oregon. The State was to pay the United States the difference, if any, between the fair market value of the property conveyed by the Secretary of the Navy and the fair market value of the lands acquired in exchange and also the cost to

agreed to all the reductions in our relative strength that have occurred.

But I do not believe so; and as my colleagues on this floor well know, I have never believed so.

The starts, stops, vacillations, and delays of the past, however, are just that—part of the past; and the hope for this Nation lies in the future.

Instead of criticism based on the past, therefore, which many can share, I suggest we all join together in offering constructive advice to the President, so that he may have a better chance of accomplishing his own primary aim, and that of all free people—peace with honor for mankind.

WHOLE FISH FLOUR

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is present in the Chamber, because I know he is very much interested in the subject about which I wish to speak.

An international conference on fish in nutrition opens in Washington tomorrow. It comes here under the sponsorship of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Its host is the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of our Department of the Interior.

This conference has enormous significance to the future of the world, because of the increasingly important role of fish in the diet of healthy people. Our ablest nutrition experts are urging our own citizens to consume fish four times as frequently as they do now. And our population experts advise us that the teeming millions of the near future can be fed adequately only with increased use of products of the sea.

High on the list of the important topics to be discussed at this 8-day conference is whole fish flour. Many members of Congress have been keenly interested in this unique product, and others may have noted the increased attention it has been receiving in the press in recent weeks. Many top officials of the Federal Government believe now that whole fish flour offers an early solution to the problem of world hunger. We have appropriated, at this session, \$50,000, for further research by our Fish and Wildlife Laboratory into the manufacture and use of this new product.

Mr. President, I have been working with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], and others in the Senate for the success of fish flour, and on the House side, with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative HASTINGS KEITH, and the gentleman from New York, Representative OTIS PIKE, in whose districts lie the only successful manufacturing plants in the Western Hemisphere.

We have filed with the Food and Drug Administration a request for that agency's approval of a proposed standard for whole fish flour. I speak today, Mr. President, not only to welcome this international conference to Washington, but to call the attention of Congress and the country to the petition now pending with the Food and Drug Administration.

This petition was published in the Federal Register on September 15, 1961, and appears there on page 8641. I request that this statement of the agency and the proposed standards be printed at the end of my remarks, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I request, also, that there be printed immediately thereafter a letter from William W. Goodrich, Assistant General Counsel of the Food and Drug Division, to my office, describing the process which the agency is bound to follow in this instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 20.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask my colleagues to note that they and the public are invited to submit comments, and that these views should be in writing, and submitted in quintuplicate, addressed to the Hearing Clerk, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, room 5440, 330 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C., prior to November 6, 1961.

There is great interest in this product in the fishing industry, which can feed all the hungry people in the world with fish that is now going to waste, or is still in the teeming ocean uncaught, because there is no practical, approved way to use it.

There is also great interest in the food for peace program, and we have had the enlightened cooperation of Mr. McGovern and Mr. SYMINGTON. There is also great interest in the civil defense agency, where a food so rich in protein and so stable may be a staff of life in a survival program.

I am confident that if the Food and Drug Administration is alert as to all these possibilities it will approve this product and this standard. I hope it can do so in something less than the "8 to 10 months" mentioned in Mr. Goodrich's letter.

The work of this agency will be assisted, if those Federal officials, those food scientists and those consumers who are interested in this product, will write their views to the Food and Drug Administration, as they have been invited to do under the law.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Federal Register of Sept. 15, 1961]
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

[21 CFR, PT. 37]

Fish: Definitions and standards of identity; standards of fill of container

Fish Protein Concentrate, Whole Fish Flour; Notice of Proposal To Establish Definition and Standard of Identity

A manufacturer approached the Food and Drug Administration to discuss a process that he has developed for manufacturing a fish flour product which could be used as a source of protein to be marketed at a price that would be most attractive when compared with the cost of other sources of protein. The article was referred to as "whole fish flour" and was to be made by taking whole fish of varying sizes, grinding them, and, after removing the fat by a chemical process,

drying the flour so produced. In some cases the flour was to be deodorized by a further process.

The Food and Drug Administration informally expressed the opinion that this "whole fish flour" should be regarded as an adulterated article under the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, because it was to be made without the removal of those portions of the fish, including the intestines and intestinal contents, that are not normally regarded as acceptable for human food in the United States. Proponents of the product, however, stated that they did not agree with this view and represented that if consumers generally were fully informed of the nature of the article they would regard it as suitable for use in their food supply.

The Commissioner of Food and Drugs has received from Mr. Harold Putnam of Washington, D.C., acting on behalf of the manufacturer of this article, and others, a petition for the establishment of a standard of identity for "whole fish flour." The Commissioner has concluded that this proposal should be published in order to afford all persons interested in this article an opportunity to comment thereon.

The proposal submitted is as follows:

"Sec. 3.75 Fish protein concentrate, whole fish flour; definition and standard of identity.

"(a) Definition: Fish protein concentrate, whole fish flour, is a food supplement consisting primarily of a dried and processed fish protein and of the naturally associated vitamins and inorganic minerals. It is derived from any species of whole and wholesome fish, handled from catch to packaging in a sanitary manner.

"(b) Standard identity—(1) Protein content: Protein content (N X 6.25), measured by methods of the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, shall not be less than 70 percent by weight of the final product (Official Methods of Analysis, A.O.A.C., 9th ed., secs. 22.011, 22.023, 22.024; ch. 22, p. 285). Biological values of the finished fish protein concentrate shall not be less than 105 percent as measured by the official A.O.A.C. method for the biological evaluation of protein quality (secs. 39.133–39.137, inclusive, ch. 39, p. 680).

"(2) Moisture and ash content: Moisture and ash contents shall not exceed 6 percent and 25 percent, respectively, by weight of the final product, measured by A.O.A.C. standards (secs. 22.003, 22.010, ch. 22, pp. 283, 284).

"(3) Fat content: Fat content shall not exceed 1 percent (sec. 18.011–18.012, inclusive, ch. 18, p. 235, or sec. 22.037, ch. 22, p. 287).

"(4) Odor and taste: The final product should have no more than a faint fish odor and taste, and when baked in bread in the ratio of 1 part of fish protein concentrate to 11 parts of grain flour, there should be no detectable fish odor or taste.

"(5) Storage stability: Fish protein concentrate, after 6 months' storage at temperatures prevailing in areas of intended use (but not exceeding 100° F. (38° C.)), and when packed in metal containers or in polyethylene bags, should show no spoilage as judged by the development of off-flavors, mold growth, production of toxic amines (histamine, tyramine), or by deterioration in protein quality as shown by digestibility and available lysine values below the specific minimums.

"(6) Bacteriology: The product should be free of *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella*, and pathogenic anaerobes, and have a total bacterial plate count of not more than 2,000 per gram.

"(7) Safety: The finished product should contain no additives, preservatives, or harmful solvent residues."

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (secs. 401,

18716

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 18

701, 52 Stat. 1046, 1055, as amended, 70 Stat. 919, 72 Stat. 948; 21 U.S.C. 341, 371) and in accordance with the authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (25 F.R. 8625), all interested persons are invited to submit their views in writing regarding the proposal published herein. Such views and comments should be submitted in quintuplicate, addressed to the Hearing Clerk, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Room 5440, 330 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 25, D.C., prior to the 60th day following the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

Dated September 7, 1961.

GEO. P. LARRICK,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

EXHIBIT 2

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
September 15, 1961.

MR. HAROLD PUTMAN,
Legislative Assistant to Senator Saltonstall,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We acknowledge your letter of September 8, in which you ask for an approximate timetable with respect to action which can be anticipated on the proposed standard for whole fish flour, which will appear in the Federal Register tomorrow, September 15.

The proposal gives interested parties 60 days within which to present their views. The Commissioner will then publish an order, acting on the proposal in the light of the comments received. The order will contain a provision giving any person who will be adversely affected by the order an opportunity to object and to request a public hearing on the objections.

After receipt of any such objections, the Commissioner will determine whether grounds for a hearing have been presented. If there are, he will, as soon as practicable, publish a notice of hearing, giving at least 30 days' notice.

The hearing will be held and time will be allowed for filing briefs, proposed findings of fact, and a proposed order. The Commissioner will act on the evidence submitted and issue a tentative order. This will be published in the Federal Register. Exceptions to the order may be filed and a final order will be issued and published. Thereafter, there is an opportunity for judicial review.

We believe that it will be a minimum of 8 to 10 months before the final order of the Commissioner can be published, depending, of course, on what comments and objections are received and, if there is a hearing, on the extent of the evidence offered.

We are required by section 701(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 371(e), and the Administrative Procedure Act, to follow the steps indicated. Please call upon us if you wish any further explanation.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM W. GOODRICH,
Assistant General Counsel,
Food and Drug Division.

MR. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. SALTONSTALL. I am happy to yield.

MR. DOUGLAS. I am very glad that the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned the question of fish flour. Fish flour has been developed by a very able citizen and businessman from the State of Illinois, Mr. Ezra Levin, who has been producing fish flour in Monticello, Ill., for several years, and who recently has established a plant in New

Bedford, Mass. He finds it possible to produce a thoroughly pure and sanitary fish flour with one pound of flour being derived from approximately 6 pounds of fish. He is able to produce the flour at a cost in the United States of approximately 12 cents a pound. If the fish taste is removed, the cost is approximately 14 cents a pound.

Fish flour contains 85 percent protein. In fact, it is really a protein concentrate. It keeps indefinitely. It has been pronounced and admitted to be completely pure and sanitary. There is not the slightest evil effect from it. It is an ideal food, particularly for the tropics, where, because of the heat and lack of refrigeration, it is almost impossible to keep meat, fish, or milk.

Therefore, it would seem to be an ideal food for that region as well as other regions. It can be sprinkled on rice and vegetables, put in soup, and baked into bread with wheat flour or cornmeal. Fish flour can be one of the great additions to the diet of the world, and more particularly to the tropical peoples who suffer from a lack of protein. For fish abound in the tropics.

The Senator from Massachusetts has been very tactful in referring to the difficulties which we have had with the Food and Drug Administration. I shall not question the motives of that organization, but I believe they have been excessively obstructive in dealing with this question. They admit that there are no evil effects from the fish flour and that, indeed, it is extremely good as a food. Their objections, curiously enough, are esthetic objections.

The whole fish is used by Mr. Levin, including the entrails and the eyes. However, these organs are treated in such a way that the flour is completely healthy, rather than the reverse. The flour itself is a powder. The Food and Drug Administration says, however, that they object to the granting of a certificate for this type of flour on esthetic grounds.

Mr. Levin, of course, has offered to have the labels fully state that the fish flour is derived from the full fish, so that there would be no delusion practiced upon the consumers. I had never thought that the Food and Drug Administration was set up to deal with esthetics. I thought it was set up to deal with public health. Therefore, I hope very much that when this conference starts in Washington, it will go thoroughly into this matter of fish flour and the obstructive tactics of the Food and Drug Administration.

A popular columnist recently wrote a somewhat satirical article on my efforts to popularize the use of fish flour. It is my intention at an early date to invite my colleagues to lunch, at which they will be able to taste the fish flour. If they do so, I am sure they will find it to be beneficial and attractive.

A MEMORIAL TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

MR. DOUGLAS. Some days ago I made a brief speech on the floor of the Senate in which I criticized the design

for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial submitted to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and I expressed the thought that we should carry out the suggestion of the gentleman from Delaware, Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, Jr., that we build instead a memorial park, of some 27 acres, in honor of President Roosevelt, one that would be a practical and living memorial benefiting the people not only of this area, but all the people of the United States.

I have since received a letter from my very close friend, Francis Biddle, who is the chairman of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, making some very interesting points in refutation of my argument. As a matter of fairness, I am very glad to ask that this letter be made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT
MEMORIAL COMMISSION,
Wellfleet, Mass., September 11, 1961.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I read with interest your remarks in a recent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD accompanying the introduction of a bill to create a Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Park, similar to the bill that was introduced this spring by HARRIS McDOWELL, in the House. I have this to say:

1. You speak of the winning design in the competition for the memorial as "useless book ends," "monumental mockery," and "giant tombstones." You do not mention the very favorable reaction to the winning design of the American Institute of Architects, Progressive Architecture, of the jury which made the award, headed by Pietro Belluschi, Dean of the School of Architecture of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and of Jose Luis Sert, Dean of the Graduate School of Design at Harvard, and the article in the Architectural Record.

Have you ever seen the design? I suspect not. It is now on exhibit in the Office of the National Capital Planning Commission, Room 7134 Interior Building. There are also admirable lantern slides and moving pictures illustrating the effect of the model against a background of trees, and the three great memorials. I feel sure that you would not want to judge a design without seeing it, which is a little like criticizing a book without reading it.

2. You say that "a living memorial" is a more appropriate way of honoring Franklin Roosevelt than a monument. What exactly do you mean by a "living memorial?" Does not the Lincoln Memorial make living the memory of Lincoln more than—to use your words—"a garden in bloom the year round," called after him?

We plan to add a statue of Franklin Roosevelt to the present design with suitable inscriptions and the monument will be one of four memorials dedicated to four great Presidents, connected by paths, surrounded by trees, with suitable parking space, forming a great park to be used by the people who loved Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the generations to come.

3. Finally, consider this. Congress unanimously directed a competition for a memorial to be erected at the point which you now wish to turn into a garden, under the direction of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission. This has been done. The Commission has not yet passed on the winning design, or made any other